CERTIFICATE OF MAILING			
Date	18 Sep	t 2001	
Signature Im Akinty			
Firm <i>or</i> Individual name	Tom Hunter, Reg. No. 38,498, The Law Offices of Jonathan Alan Quine		
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT			
Incomplete Res	to Missing Parts/ Application ponse to Missing s under 37 CFR 2 or 1.53	this paper or during the pendency of this application, including any extensions of time for consideration of the documents enclosed. Remarks	
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)		Authorization to Charge Deposit Account Please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0893 for any additional fees associated with	
Information	Disclosure Statement	Request for Refund	

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an

Date

9-18-01

envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on this date:

Buch

Tracie Brooks

Typed or printed name

Signature

6,411/636

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on 9-18-0

LAW OFFICES OF JONATHAN ALAN QUINE

Lian Brooks

Atty Docket No: 305T-900500US Client Ref: SF2000-036-1

RCT SES SO SON

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

OSAMU TETSU, KENICHI WAKITA, and FRANK MCCORMICK

Application No.: 09/687,593

Filed: 10/13/2000

For: MAMMALIAN TWO-HYBRID SYSTEM FOR SCREENING FOR MODULATORS OF THE ACCUMULATION OF METABOLIC PRODUCTS

Examiner: Bronwen M. Loeb, Ph.D.

Art Unit: 1636

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Assistant Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated 07/30/2001, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the following remarks. A petition to extend the period of response for one month(s) is enclosed.

In the 07/30/2001 Office Action the Examiner required restriction to one of the following groups under 35 U.S.C. §121:

Group I: Claims 1-21, drawn to a method of screening for an agent that

modulates the ability of a cell to accumulate or to degrade a metabolic

product;

Group II: Claims 22-39, drawn to a method of selectively expressing an effector

gene in a cell that accumulates or degrades a metabolic product:

Group III: Claims 40-59, drawn to a method of selectively killing a cell that

accumulates a metabolic product; and

Application No.: 09/687,593

Page 2

Group IV: Claims 60-92, drawn to a recombinant cell and a nucleic acid; and

Group V: Claim 93, drawn to a compound that modulates the ability of a cell to

accumulate or to degrade a metabolic product.

In response to this restriction requirement, Applicants provisionally elect Group I, claims 1-21 with traverse.

Applicants submit that restriction between Groups I, II, III, and IV is unnecessary. According to MPEP §803, the Examiner should examine all claims in an application, even though they are directed to distinct inventions, unless to do so would create a serious burden. In the instant case, the claims of Groups I, II, and III are all drawn to methods that utilize a two-hybrid system that exploits the interaction between a metabolic product and a ligand that binds to that metabolic product. The methods of Group I use this two-hybrid system with an effector gene to identify agents that modulate the ability of a cell to accumulate or to degrade the metabolic product. The methods of Group II use this two-hybrid system to selectively express the effector gene in a cell that accumulates or degrades the metabolic product. The methods of Group III use this two-hybrid system with an effector that is a cytotoxin to selectively kill a cell that accumulates or degrades the metabolic product.

A search for prior art relevant to this two-hybrid system is expected to identify any prior art, if such exists, relevant to all three methods. Thus examination of the methods of Groups I, II, and III entails no greater burden than examination of any one of these groups alone. Accordingly, there is serious burden entailed by examining Groups I-III together and Applicants respectfully request that the restriction between these groups be withdrawn.

Group IV is drawn to a cell comprising the two-hybrid system described above. Again, a search for prior art relevant to this two-hybrid system is expected to identify any prior art, if such exists, relevant to all to the cell as well as to the claimed methods. Thus examination of the methods of Groups I, II, III, and IV entails no greater burden than examination of any one of these groups alone. Thus, the restriction between Groups I, II, III, and IV should be withdrawn.

Application No.: 09/687,593

Page 3

If a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (510) 337-7871.

LAW OFFICES OF JONATHAN ALAN QUINE

P.O. BOX 458

Alameda, CA 94501 Tel: 510 337-7871 Fax: 510 337-7877 Respectfully submitted,

Tom Hunter

Reg. No: 38,498